

# **Missile Defense Conference: Does Poland Need the Missile Shield?**

**Organized by the Institute of Strategic Studies  
Conference Held at Palac Pugetow, ul Starowislana 12  
June 29, 2007  
11:00 am**

Good morning.

I'd like to thank Bodgan Klich and his think tank, the Institute of Strategic Studies, for inviting me here today. I'd also like to say a special word of greeting to Mr.

Waszczykowski, the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs and chief Polish negotiator on missile defense, Mr. Guy Roberts, the NATO Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy, Dr. Patricia Sanders, the Executive Director of the US Missile Defense Agency and my colleague Ambassador Kopecky, the Czech Ambassador to Poland. I'm very glad to see you all here.

I'd also like to greet the audience and all the distinguished journalists and academics who will be participating in the second panel today.

Let me begin today by describing the threat we face.

## **The Threat**

- Rogue states view ballistic missiles as a means for gaining or maintaining their own freedom of action
- North Korea uses missiles for coercion, intimidation and deterrence – proliferates to other nations
- Iran views ballistic missiles as element of asymmetric strategy against U.S. and allies – proliferates to both state and non-state actors

- Lebanon crisis demonstrated – rogue state support of non-state actors use of ballistic missiles and rockets as terror weapons
- Now more than 20 countries have a ballistic missile capability

### **Poland's Role**

- Polish participation in the European element of the Missile Defense program would provide Poland and our NATO allies with protection against ballistic missiles fired by states such as Iran.
- This, in turn, would deter the small scale use of ballistic missiles and so protect us against that form of nuclear blackmail.
- Our system presents no threat to Russia as the 10 interceptors we propose to base in Poland are too few and too close to even put a dent in Russia's arsenal of ballistic missiles.
- Moreover, our interceptors do not carry an explosive warhead. Their solid-shot front end destroys a target with the force of impact high above the earth's surface where the few fragments that survive the supersonic collision are likely to be burned up upon reentry to the earth's atmosphere.
- In any case, we remain sensitive to Polish concerns that Missile Defense might spur Russia to deploy additional military assets in the region.
- We also understand Poland's concern that Missile Defense might attract the attention of terrorists in search of high profile targets.

- So, we are now negotiating the modalities of broader defense cooperation with Poland. We just wrapped up the highly successful second round of negotiations with Polish officials in Washington D.C. on June 25.
- However, I must remind you that NATO remains the cornerstone of our security and that the security guarantees provided for in Article V of The Washington Treaty already commit us to the defense of Poland.
- Finally, Putin's proposal to base radar in Azerbaijan is "interesting," it represents an opportunity for constructive dialogue that we will pursue. However, that radar would supplement and not replace the Czech radar site. So, as Secretary Rice has stated, negotiations with Poland and the Czech Republic will continue.

### **NATO involvement**

- NATO's 26 countries agreed to assess by February 2008 the political and military implications for the Alliance of the US missile defense system.
- In essence, the Alliance will pursue a three-track approach to missile defense: continue the ongoing NATO project to develop by 2010 a "theatre missile defense" for protecting troops deployed on missions from missile threats; assess the full implications of the US system for the Alliance, and continue existing cooperation with Russia on theatre missile defense as well as consultations on related issues.
- The decision was announced by the Secretary General on the first day of a meeting of NATO Defense Ministers at the Alliance's Headquarters in Brussels, 14 June.

- He stressed that discussions on missile defense were based on two key principles: the “indivisibility of security” and that there could not be “A or B” NATO members in terms of protection from missile threats.
- Specifically the Secretary General said that the study will focus on the possibility of “bolting” NATO’s theatre missile defense on the US system to ensure that all of Alliance territory would be covered from missile threats.

### **Altitude of Intercept**

- Intercepts of ballistic missiles launched from Iran and targeted at the United States would likely occur at very high altitudes, usually in excess of 150 kilometers and outside the atmosphere.
- The U.S. interceptors do not carry explosive warheads and are totally non-nuclear; therefore, any nuclear detonation could only be attributed to the attacker’s warhead. One of the advantages of a kinetic-energy kill interceptor is that it would likely destroy the attacker’s warhead completely before it could detonate.
- Any electro-magnetic pulse (EMP) effects from such an explosion would be greatly mitigated by the very high altitudes at which intercepts take place.
- Furthermore, such effects would pale in comparison to a nuclear detonation in a city.

### **Russian/Ukrainian Visits to the European Site**

- The U.S. has extended an open invitation for Russian officials to visit missile defense facilities in the United States.

- The U.S. has offered to Russia other transparency and confidence-building measures, such as data exchanges and the opportunity to observe missile defense flight-tests. Furthermore, the U.S. has offered to cooperate with Russia on missile defense technology, research and development.

Thank you